

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24-30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42 and 43 are pending in the present application. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39 and 41 have been canceled, Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 20-22, 24-26, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 have been amended and Claims 42 and 43 have been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 32, 33, 36 and 37 were objected to; Claims 1-41 were provisionally rejected as unpatentable over Claims 1-51 of co-pending Application No. 10/114,248; Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 16, 17 and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al.; Claims 30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Official Notice; Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Goder et al.; Claims 31, 33, 35, 37, 39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Official Notice; and Claims 5-8, 13-15, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Goder et al.

Regarding the objections to Claims 32, 33, 36 and 37, the appropriate claims have been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action.

Further, regarding the provisional rejection, attached is a terminal disclaimer. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Claims 22 and 24 have been amended to clarify the subject matter and are not believed to narrow the scopes of

the claims. Thus, Claims 22 and 24 are believed to be in compliance with the requirements of the statute.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 16, 17 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a processing apparatus that includes a processing apparatus body that executes a prescribed process to a target object, a control mechanism that controls the processing apparatus body, and an information storage section that receives a signal inputted and outputted to and from the control mechanism containing information necessary for grasping an operational record of the processing apparatus body during an execution of the prescribed process to the target object. The information storage section also stores the information every prescribed time period. Further, the information includes alarm data that includes data notifying malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body during the execution of the prescribed process. Independent Claims 5, 9, 13, 16, 20 and 25 include similar features.

By providing such an information storage section, a precise process control of the processing apparatus body is achieved by quickly attending to malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body (see the specification, page 3, lines 6-15).

On the contrary, Park et al. disclose a first controller 120 and/or second controller 150 that include a wafer information reading unit 121, an optimal process parameter setting unit 122 and a control command generation unit 123. The wafer information reading unit 121 reads wafer information. The optimal process parameter setting unit 122 receives the data read by the wafer information reading unit 121 and determines an optimal process parameter. Based on the optimal process parameter, the control command generation unit 123 generates control commands that are used to control unit control devices to perform unit processes (see Park et al., column 3, line 53 to, column 4, line 32 and Figures 2 and 3). However, Park et al.

do not disclose an information storage section storing information including at least alarm data including data notifying malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body during the execution of said prescribed process. As such, Park et al. are unable to quickly attend to malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body, thus do not achieve precise process control of the processing apparatus body.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 16, 20 and 25 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Claims 30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Official Notice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 depend on Claims 1, 9 and 16, which as discussed above are believed to be allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Goder et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 5 is directed to a processing apparatus that includes a processing apparatus body including a plurality of process units that executes a prescribed process to a target object and a transport apparatus that moves the target object between the plurality of process units; a first controller that controls the processing apparatus body as a whole, a second controller that controls the plurality of process units and an information storage section that receives a signal containing information necessary for grasping an operational record of the processing apparatus body during an execution of the prescribed process to the target object transmitted and received between the first controller and the second controller. The information storage section also stores the information every prescribed time period. Further, the information includes alarm data that includes data notifying malfunctions and

troubles in the processing apparatus body during the execution of the prescribed process.

Independent Claims 1, 9, 13, 16, 20 and 25 include similar features.

By providing such an information storage section, a precise process control of the processing apparatus body is achieved by quickly attending to malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body (see the specification, page 3, lines 6-15).

On the contrary, Goder et al. disclose a memory/storage device 706 that stores a recipe executor. Further the memory/storage device 706 is in communication via communication link 702 with one or more processors 704 (see Goder et al., column 10, lines 1-27 and Figure 4). Goder et al. also disclose one or more computer processing systems executing a given set of instructions (recipes) to perform wafer processing (see Goder et al., column 3, lines 43-58 and Figures 1-3). Goder et al. disclose one example of recipes (see column 6, line 30 to, column 7, line 15). However, Goder et al. do not disclose an information storage section storing information including at least alarm data including data notifying malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body during the execution of said prescribed process. As such, Goder et al. are unable to quickly attend to malfunctions and troubles in the processing apparatus body, thus do not achieve precise process control of the processing apparatus body.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 16, 20 and 25 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Further, the claim rejections for Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Goder et al. and Claims 31, 33, 35, 37, 39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Official Notice are moot in view of canceling of the claims.

Application No. 10/023,898  
Reply to Office Action of August 13, 2003,

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

David A. Bilodeau  
Registration No. 42,325

GJM/DAB/GS:mda  
I:\ATTY\GS\21s\217502\AME.DOC